UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,606	10/29/2003	Gregory Wolff	015358-005210US	9621

20350   7590   10/29/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
MEUCCI, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/697,606</td><td>Applicant(s)
WOLFF, GREGORY</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
MICHAEL D. MEUCCI</td><td>Art Unit
2442</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 January 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>12-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>12-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 October 2003 and 18 November 2005</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/5/07, 10/25/07</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 03 July 2007.

2.   This application has been reassigned to Michael Meucci.

3.   Claims 12-24 are currently pending.

Terminal Disclaimer

4.   The terminal disclaimer filed on 28 January 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion

of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date

of U.S. Pat. No. 6,668,271 B1 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal

disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Edwards et al. (U.S. 6,562,076 B2), hereinafter referred to as Edwards.

         a.   As to claims 12 and 24, Edwards teaches: configuring a plurality pf agency

base units (Fig. 3, Principals 1-n) such that each agency unit is addressable at an

address on the network (Fig. 3, DMS NFS server; col 3, lines 57-63; col 13, lines 1-42;

Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28); storing, on an agent card of a plurality of agent

cards (Fig. 3, repositories 14a-14n), at least one response functionality implementing

one or more document response functions (active property attached to the document)

(lines 43-47 of column 10; col 10, line 61 - col 11, line 63; col 13, lines 1-42); storing, on

the agent card, state for the at least one response functionality that is provided to a user

(lines 43-57 of column 10) of the network at an address dependent on the address of

the agency base unit into which the agent card is mounted, wherein the state included

on the agent card is a state of the at least one response functionality (col. 10, line 61 -

col 11, line 63; col. 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col. 13, line 44 - col. 14, line 28).

     b.   As to claim 13, The method of claim 1, mounting the agent card to the

agency base unit (Fig. 3, col 3, lines 57-63; col 10, line 61 - col 11, line 63; col. 13, lines

1-42; Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col i4, line 28); and triggering the at least one response

functionality by a document request issued to the agency base unit over the network

(Fig. 3, col 3, lines 57-63; col. 10, line 61 - col 11, line 63; col: 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col

13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col 14, line 49 - col. 15, line 35).

     c.   As to claim 14, further comprising coupling the plurality of agency base

units are coupled to an agency device (Fig. 3, DMS NFS server; col 3, lines 57-63; col.

10, line 61 - col. 11, line 63; col 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col

14, line 49- col 15, line 35).

d.   As to claim 15, further comprising coupling the plurality of agency base units are coupled to an HTTP server (Fig. 4; DMS NFS server; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col 14, line 49- col. 15, line 35).

e.   As to Claim 16, further comprising storing the sate as an XML file in a file system on the agent card (col 3, lines 40-45).

f.   As to claim 17, further comprising storing transformations of documents as described by a tagset are stored as a tagset file in a file system on the agent card (Fig. 3, MS NFS server; col. 3, lines 57-63; col 10, line 61 - col. 11, line 63; col. 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col 14, line 49- col. 15, line 35).

g.   As to claim 18, further comprising adapting the agent card with program instructions for applying transforms specified in a tagset to a document (Fig. 3, MS NFS server; col 3, lines 57-63; col 10, line 61 - col 11, line 63; col 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col. 14, line 49 - col 15, line 35).

h.   As to claim 19, further comprising storing state, tagsets and data in a file structure (Fig. 3, MS NFS server; col 3, lines 57-63; col 70, line 61 - col. 11, line 63; col. 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col 14, line 49 - col 15, line 35).

j.   As to claim 20, further comprising storing state, tagsets and data in a static file structure (Fig. 3, MS NFS server; col. 3, lines 57,63; col 10, line 61 - col. 11, line 63~ col 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col 14, line 49- col 15, line 35).

k.   As to claim 21, further comprising adapting the agent card to perform on-card processing for processing messages received from an agency through a message

passing interface (Fig. 3, MS NFS server; col 3, lines 57-63; col 10, line 61 - col 11, line

63; col. 13, lines 1-42; Fig. 4; col. 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col. 14, line 49 - col 15,

line 35).

       l.   As to claim 22, further comprising processing, on the agent card,

messages received from an agency through a message passing interface (Fig. 3, MS

NFS server; col 3, lines 57-63; coL 10, line 61 - col 11, line 63; col 13, lines i-42; Fig. 4;

col 13, line 44 - col 14, line 28; col 14, line 49 - col. 15, line 35).

      m.   As to claim 23, further comprising: monitoring for an ejection request

indicating a desire to eject the agent card (col. 15, lines 10-58); and in response to

receipt of the ejection request, writing a state of the agent card to the agent card prior to

the agent card being removed from the agency base unit (col. 15, lines 10-58).

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 03 July 2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

8.   (A)   Regarding claim 12, the applicant contends that Edwards does not teach:

the claimed agency base units or the claimed agent cards. The examiner respectfully

disagrees.

      As to point (A), the applicant argues that an agent card may be mounted onto an

agency base unit to provide a particular function or service to a networked user via the

agency base unit. The examiner points out that the repositories 14a-14n (agent cards)

are mounted in external document storage back-end components (agency base units)

at "C" of Fig. 3. Edwards discloses: "Similarly, back-end components C can include a

plurality of repositories 14a-14n, where the content of documents are stored. Such

repositories can include the hard disc of a principal's computer, a file system server, a

web page, a dynamic real time data transmission source, as well as other data

repositories," (lines 12-17 of column 11). It is clear from this recitation that Edwards

teaches agency base units and agent cards. As such, the rejection remains proper and

is maintained by the examiner.

9.   (B)   Regarding claim 12, the applicant contends that Edwards does not teach:

configuring a plurality of agency base units such that each agency base unit is

addressable at an address on the network. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

       As to point (B), the applicant argues that the documents are accessed through

the DMS system either directly or indirectly by various front end applications. The

examiner points out that the Network File System (NFS) supports sharing of files,

printers, and other resources such as persistent storage over a computer network. This

is sole purpose of the NFS system. As such, this requires that the back end

components (base units) of Edwards are addressable at an address on the network.

Edwards explicitly states: "However, using the NFS layer provides uniform access to a

variety of other repositories (so that documents available over the Web appear in the

same space as documents in a networked file system)," (lines 33-36 of column 13). As

such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the examiner.

10.   (C)   Regarding claim 12, the applicant contends that Edwards does not teach:

the agent cards and that the storage repositories of Edwards do not provide for storing

at least one response functionality for implementing one or more document request

response functions. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As to point (C), agent cards have been discussed above in point (A). The

functionality for implementing one or more document request response functions is

taught in Edwards: "By instead providing a filesystem interface directly to these

applications, it makes it possible to execute relevant properties on the content and

property read/write path. Furthermore, it is ensured that relevant properties (such as

ones which record when the document was last used or modified) are kept up-to-date,"

(lines 19-24 of column 13); and " With further reference to FIG. 4, the application 115

includes one or more functions 180 which are designed to be active properties

attachable to a document. The functions 180 are executable programs or routines which

perform management functions for a document to which they are attached when the

application 115 is not running. In other words, application 115 attaches a management

function 185 as an active property for document 110 which is selected from the set of

functions 180. In this manner, application 115 has the ability to control the state and/or

behavior of document 110 even when application 115 is not processing document 110,"

(lines 29-40 of column 14). It is clear from this recitation that Edwards teaches storing

at least one response functionality for implementing one or more document request

response functions. As such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the

examiner.

Conclusion

11.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone

number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442